

Seattle Waterfront Partners Group

Meeting

August 5, 2005

ATTENDEES

WPG MEMBERS

Sally Bagshaw	<i>Allied Arts of Seattle</i>
Angela Belbeck	<i>Seattle Board of Park Commissioners</i>
Sydney Dobson	<i>Seattle Architectural Foundation</i>
Ardis Dumett	<i>Office of Senator Patty Murray</i>
Tim King	<i>WA State Ferries/Colman Dock</i>
Bea Kumasaka	<i>Belltown Neighborhood</i>
Mark Miller	<i>Waterfront Landing Condominiums</i>
Melinda Miller	<i>Port of Seattle</i>
Jim Mueller	<i>J. C. Muller LLC</i>
Denny Onslow	<i>Downtown Seattle Assoc./Harbor Properties</i>
Ralph Pease	<i>Argosy Cruises</i>
David Spiker	<i>Seattle Design Commission, Chair</i>
Barbara Swift	<i>Swift & Co Landscape Architecture</i>
Heather Trim	<i>People for Puget Sound</i>
Judith Whetzel	<i>Triangle property owners</i>
David Yeaworth	<i>Allied Arts of Seattle</i>

GUESTS

Michal Russo	<i>University of Washington MLA & MUP</i>
Joe Follansbee	<i>Association of King Co. Historical Orgs</i>
Annie Breckenfeld	<i>People for Puget Sound</i>
Paul Lacy	<i>WSDOT</i>
Wolfgang Loera	<i>ILWU Local 19</i>

STAFF

Paul Chasan	<i>DPD – Planning Division/CityDesign</i>
Layne Cubell	<i>DPD – Planning Division/CityDesign & Design Commission</i>
David Graves	<i>DPR</i>
Steve Moddemeyer	<i>DPD – Planning Division</i>
Steve Pearce	<i>SDOT</i>
John Rahaim	<i>DPD – Planning Division</i>
Guillermo Romano	<i>DPD – Planning Division/CityDesign</i>
Robert Scully	<i>DPD – Planning Division/CityDesign</i>
Kevin Stoops	<i>DPR</i>
Barbara Wilson	<i>DPD – Planning Commission</i>

CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS (5 MIN)

WPG MISSION STATEMENT

John Rahaim reviewed two changes he made to mission statement based on prior discussions. These are bullets 5 & 7 under the first paragraph

- **Bullet 5:** The primary audience for the advice of the WPG will be the City of Seattle, but the WPG will advocate for the vision of the waterfront to a broad range of entities, including other public agencies, developers, and the general public; to

effectively advise the City, the WPG will on occasion present their advice to Seattle elected officials

- **Bullet 7:** The WPG will seek public input through forums that may include public meetings

Both changes were approved unanimously

ALLIED ARTS' 'DESIGN COLLABORATIVE'

David Yeaworth of Allied Arts discussed the recent Allied Arts' Design Collaborative and how it might be coordinated with the Waterfront Concept Plan.

- This was a collaborative, not a charette. It was not a competitive, exercise, but a group of designers working together.
- Intent to play the role of citizens, not the role of government
- As a citizens group, AA can propose and say things that government can't say and do.
- This exercise differed from previous charettes in that now it is time to begin to synthesize the best ideas from previous work on the waterfront.
- Political context has changed since 2003 charette. There are more politically realistic constraints such as, further insights on the waterfront trolley, concert piers, the ferry terminal, the new Lid and Terminal 46's future and SDOT's need for guidance on a future AK way configuration
- To Achieve AA's political goal: Show that "you can have a waterfront for all", they reached out to like-minded groups including people who may have been excluded from previous visioning efforts and brought them together as a coalition of groups to identify priorities
- AA Took six teams of designers and broke into geographic sections which will then be married into one vision these were: Stadium, Pioneer Sq., Colman Flats, Yesler Way, Central Waterfront, Pike Place Area, Belltown
- **AA will hold an Internal Presentation of Their Latest Waterfront Vision.** All Waterfront Partners Group members are invited.
 - Aug 23rd
 - The Moore Theater
 - Reception at 6:00 pm, presentation at 7:00 pm
 - Email David Yeaworth for a ticket
- **Questions / Comments**
- **Q:** When will it be presented to the public
A: at AA beer and culture nights throughout the autumn
- **Q:** How this ties into the city process?
 - Is this a parallel planning process?,
 - Why is this different than the city's design?*A: By the end of the year the city will have a "concept plan". In an ideal world, AA's work relates into the city's work. It is important that the two efforts relate to one another*

- Natural tendency for two processes to go off on their own paths the city's effort should leap-frog AA's
- One group should acknowledge the other
- The city should acknowledge AA's process
- **Q:** How do we make sure that the more radical stuff that ASA puts forward doesn't get lost in the process:
Q: Can city's plan show diverse drawings, can council endorse alt. ideas?
A: AA has asked designers to look at the tunnel in both 15 year & 50 year timeline

Comment: elected officials like the phased approach (A. Dumett)

Comment: Judith Whetzel is concerned that by phasing projects, we will lose the vision

- **Q (Directed to John Rahaim):** What do you hope to get from Council?
A: We need council to accept a plan is developed to a high level of detail with its policy aspects but the design elements are at a low level of detail.
- **Q (Directed to John Rahaim):** What will the WPG's role be in funding the project
A: The city will ask the WPG to help procure funding
- **Comment:** The City generally fails at developing a formal communications plan for civic projects. We need such a plan that targets funding etc...
General support was expressed by WPG for this idea
- **Comment (Steve Pearce SDOT):** Time is urgent with this project. For public safety reasons, WSDOT cannot afford to wait until the plan is developed. Thus the construction deadlines are driving the planning.
 - Construction will start in 2009
 - WSDOT hopes to hit 60% design by mid next year
 - Choices regarding how the Lid is engineered and where utilities are placed will have huge impacts that effectively restrict future possibilities on the surface)

SUMMARY OF AA DESIGN COLLABORATIVE

- Make sure not to water down the AA process
 - City should endorse/acknowledge, the process but the two don't need to be married too closely
- A Communications Plan Subcommittee should be established.

Belltown Lid

Q: Belltown residents want to know what the status is with the proposal to continue the tunnel underground to Elliott and Western

A: There is about a \$100-200 million difference the lid put fourth under ‘Option C’ that Belltown favors. Under this scenario, the Belltown Lid continues underneath Elliott and Western and goes over the RR.

CENTRAL WATERFRONT PARK FEASIBILITY STUDY

Context

Kevin Stoops from the Department of Parks and Recreation briefed the WPG about the central waterfront park feasibility study.

The drawings that came out of the study were intended to be exploratory concepts, not designs for the lid idea.

The study looked at:

- Economic aspects (e.g. can mixed use development on the lid help fund park maintenance)
- Habitat
- Refining ideas to incorporate aquarium designs
- Now trying to provide quiet water during fish migration

Parks received a letter from City Council questioning alternatives. The letter asked them to slow down and work with DPD on the project.

DPD’s Rough Project Schedule

- 2006 Draft Plan
- Late Next Summer Recommendations
- Preferred alt end of 2006

Parks used older *Portal to the Pacific* plan when coming up with designs. Older plan had looked at piers in and around the aquarium.

- Pier 59 to remain the aquarium
- Piers 6263 will remain future open space

Comments

- Parks was asked to send a copy of the council’s letter to the WPG group
- Aforementioned communications plan needs to include a project schedule
- By writing the letter to Parks, Council has effectively said the Portal to the Pacific Plan is dead, a new direction is needed

Q: What opportunities were lost?

A: If we (Parks) move very fast, we thought we could open a new venue for summer concerts on the pier by 2008

Comments: Various people questioned the wisdom of rushing to build a new park considering the changing patterns on the waterfront. For example, does it make sense to build a new park when the waterfront will be unusable for 8-10 years of construction? Will the pier be needed for construction staging? Having

concerts on Pier 62-63 is not a given for the future waterfront. Aquarium design is not a given

Q: What was the goal of the letter that Council sent to parks?

A: The goal is that Park's effort needs to be reflected by DPD.

- Broader public debate
- More intense public input

- **Summary:** The pier 62-63 issue is a timing issue. The city needs a concept plan at the official level to allow parks et al to move forward with their projects/planning efforts. At the same the projects are driving the schedules.

Comment: We need an ORG chart showing who is in charge.

Response: There is nobody in charge this is an iterative decision making process. Parks came in due to an issue with the piers.

Comment: City Council should be brought into the process. Either via a letter from the WPG or they should be invited to sit in on WPG meetings. Or alternatively, the WPG could have some kind of scheduled communication with them. For example, they could be sent copies of the meeting minutes.

SUMMARY OF CW PARK FEASIBILITY STUDY

- WPG will write a letter to council discussing Timing and Coordination issues. WPG should develop a communications plan. (Sally Bagshaw volunteered)
- Parks will forward the letter they received from city council to members of the WPG

SUBCOMMITTEES

John Rahaim facilitated a conversation on setting up subcommittees to work on various topics.

Suggested topics included

- Implementation
- Land Use
- Environment
- Central Waterfront Parks Feasibility Study

There was general discussion regarding the need for these committees and whether any other committees should be added to the list.

JR replied with a word of caution on the danger of subcommittees and the inherent risk of being bogged down by time consuming process. He urged WPG members to keep committees simple.

After some debate over the merits of an environment committee and a transportation committee, the WPG settled on three initial committees.

- Communication
- Implementation

- Land Use (including parks)

Transportation and mobility would be left for later
As environment work has been done, we will wait on this one.

People then signed up for to work on the various subcommittees. See last sheet for list

The committees will report back to the larger group at the next WPG meeting.

REMINDER: Reception w/ mayor to launch Waterfront Concept Plan

- Sept 7th
- 5-7 PM in
- Seattle Municipal Tower

SUBCOMMITTEE ROSTER

Communication

Steve Moddemeyer
Sally Bagshaw
Jim Mueller
Catherine Stanford
Sydney Dobson

Implementation

Denny Onslow
Tim King
Steve Moddemeyer
Wolfgang Loera
Catherine Stanford
Melinda Miller
Sally Bagshaw
David Spiker
David Yeaworth
Sydney Dobson
Heather Trim

Land Use / Parks

Marc Miller
Herald Ugles
Bea Kumasaka
Judy Whetzel
Ralph Pease
Melinda Miller
David Yeaworth
Heather Trim
Jim Mueller

NEXT MEETING

Friday, September 9, 2005 at 1:00pm to 3:00pm in the Boards and Commissions Room
L280 in Seattle City Hall